DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 390 724 SO 025 409

AUTHOR	Dickens, Cynthia Sullivan
TITLE	Modeling Possibilities: Relationship Patterns among Feminist Faculty Collaborators.
PUB DATE	95
NOTE	27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 18-22, 1995).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Cooperation; *Females; *Feminism; Higher Education; Researchers; Research Opportunities; Social Science Research; *Womens Studies

ABSTRACT

There is an increased interest in women's studies, part cularly in the area of feminist scholarship. At the same time fewer women are present in the academic world. This study explores the need for women to collaborate more with other women in order to promote confidence and competitiveness. Previous research has shown that women who collaborated with both men and women have produced successful research and gained important recognition. Using a protocol which consisted of 35 open-ended questions, this study examined how 28 women from 18 different academic departments and fields in the social sciences, humanities, and professional schools shared information to produce successful results. (JAG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 390 724

MODELING POSSIBILITIES: RELATIONSHIP PATTERNS AMONG FEMINIST FACULTY COLLABORATORS

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
San Francisco, California
April 22, 1995

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Cynthia S. Dickens

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Cynthia Sullivan Dickens
Department of Educational Leadership
Mississippi State University

This research was conducted under the auspices of The Ohio State University. Author can be reached at P.O. Drawer LH, Mississippi State, MS 39762; (601) 325-8235 or e-mail dickens@ra.msstate.edu

SO 035 409

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Since the first women's studies program was formally approved at San Diego State University in 1970 (Musil, 1992), academic women have witnessed the rapid development of women's studies programs and have seen a significant increase in the opportunities for the production and dissemination of explicitly feminist research. Despite this surging interest in women as a legitimate area of scholarship, however, the status of women scholars, support for their research, and the acceptance of feminist research methodologies rema'n controversial on many campuses and in many fields.

Most American colleges and universities, not unlike other powerful and prestigious social institutions, have historically employed a relatively homogeneous group of middle and upper class white males who shared similar socioeconomic roots, educational experiences, and values. And despite the affirmative action legislation of 1972 and the subsequent efforts to attract women and minorities to academe, men continue to outnumber women in the American professorate at a ratio of three to one ("New Federal Data, " 1993). Women faculty members, working primarily in liberal arts colleges, community colleges, and comprehensive universities, are underrepresented in the more prestigious and well-funded institutions and fields, particularly at the higher professorial ranks. Furthermore, those women who hold full-time, tenure-track positions in research institutions often work in such traditionally female fields as nursing, home economics, library science, and education, or they are located in departments in which the majority of the faculty are men (Ransom, 1990). In addition to their continuing underrepresentation in positions of power, prestige, and influence, many argue that their specific research interests, experiences, and preferred methodologies receive less recognition and support than the male-defined projects that characterize mainstream scholarship.

In the face of these contradictions, however, many women scholars are developing successful careers, strong research programs, and confidence as feminists and scholars. Building meaningful careers in research institutions requires faculty--both men and women--to manage successfully the conflicts which develop between their commitments and the prevailing norms of the discipline. Because of their minority status, however, the professional relationships and friendships that

women faculty form with other women on university campuses may be of particular importance in helping them to overcome feelings of isolation, to construct identities as legitimate scholars, and to develop effective research strategies. Moreover, these relationships may provide the support that many women either desire or need to pursue their particular research interests with confidence in competitive research institutions.

To work in collaboration with other scholars with whom they share a gender consciousness as well as research interests would seem to offer a variety of professional and personal advantages to women who also share feminist values and political commitments. Collaborative scholarship, however, is not universally valued in the academy. As feminist sociologist and frequent collaborator Mary Frank Fox (1985, p. 271) noted:

> Freedom and independence are certainly strong precepts in science and scholarship...and scholarship tends to attract the "solitary mind." Yet the solitary dispositions and independent norms of science and scholarship are contravened by the communalism of the work....The communalism and exchange of research engenders cooperation and interdependence....[W]e need to know much more about the way in which collegiality operates.

This study attempts to add to knowledge of "collegiality" and how it operates through the process of collaboration. Studies of faculty collaboration, particularly studies employing qualitative methods, are rare (Austin & Baldwin, 1991), and little is known about the social relationships that develop among women faculty who work collaboratively in the competitive and individualistic culture of the American research university. This paper reports the findings of an interpretive study of 26 women faculty who worked in research universities in the Midwestern United States, who were affiliated with women's studies programs, and who chose to conduct their research or engage in scholarly writing in collaboration with another woman or women. It draws theoretical support from the research on collaboration and coauthorship in academic scholarship. Its focus on women is further supported by the educational and sociological research on faculty women and feminist studies of women's friendships, values, and culture. Inquiry in

these overlapping areas contributes to an understanding of research university environments and why women historically have been underrepresented and undervalued. It also sheds light on the cultural knowledge and values that women are likely to bring to their scholarship and their collaborative partnerships.

Women, the Academy, and Collaboration: An Historical View

Women Faculty and Their Status in the Academy

Although women have held faculty positions in American colleges and universities since the nineteenth century, they were rarely the focus of social science research until 1964 when Bernard presented an argument for bringing more women into higher education to address the shortage of qualified instructional faculty. By the late '60s however other faculty women in the social sciences were focusing attention on doctoral-trained women and comparing their academic careers with men along such dimensions as field, marital status, children, productivity, income, and other professional and personal characteristics. Simon, Clark, and Galway (1967, p. 236) found that the differences between men and women were relatively small and decreasing but women faculty felt that they had failed to gain full acceptance in the academic "club."

Other studies of faculty women documented the underrepresentation of women in specific institutions and fields and began to explore reasons for the career patterns which emerged (Bayer & Astin, 1975; Graham, 1970, 1978; Lewin & Duchan, 1971; and Tidball, 1976). Particularly after passage of affirmative action legislation, the careers, status, and productivity of women faculty members were carefully scrutinized, and efforts were made to explain the continuing evidence of discrimination against women despite their gains on a number of traditional productivity measures (Astin, 1978). Kaufman (1978), looking at structural rather than psychological barriers, explored colleagial-friend relationships and concluded that women's exclusion from male networks served to isolate them from important informal contacts and leave them at a professional disadvantage.

Subsequent research on academic women acknowledged women's disadvantage (Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Fox, 1984) and frequent isolation in an institutional culture long dominated by

men. Menges and Exum (1983) argued that women and minority faculty progressed more slowly through the academic ranks because of the distinctive problems that they faced in negotiating peer review processes that favor the scholarship and career patterns associated with white males. Langland and Gove (1981) observed that women's studies programs had begun to alter faculty scholarship but had yet to have a substantial influence on the traditional curriculum, noting that women's studies remained the voice of the outsider in academe.

Without minimizing the obstacles which academic women continued to face in their struggles to succeed as "women-of knowledge," Simeone (1987, p. 75) contended that the situation for women had improved, citing as evidence:

> ...the growing prominence of women's studies and feminist scholarship, the expansion of women's scholarly and professional networks for communication and support, the increasing numbers of women faculty at research institutions, the implementation of anti-discrimination laws, and the increasing publication rates for women.

Although many scholars agreed with Simeone's contention, research in the 1990s continued to document women's isolation and exclusion from informal male networks and positions of power and to draw on the feminist themes of connected and caring relationships to theorize women's relationships to the academy. Moore and Sagaria (1991) documented the underrepresentation of women from positions of power in elite research universities and editorial boards and argued for "...rethinking graduate education and junior faculty experiences as a time of individualistic challenge and competition to a time of mutual investment in talent development, generativity, and collaboration (p. 196).

Women's Friendships, Values, and Culture

The values and relationships that have long been associated with women in Western culture--nurturance, reciprocity, intimacy, mutuality, care and concern for others--appear repeatedly both implicitly and explicitly in the literature on collaboration. In the late '70s, Appley and Winder developed a theory of collaboration that evoked the themes of caring, commitment, and

consciousness (or reflexivity) which are central in feminist inquiry. Conceptualized as a value system providing an alternative to competition and hierarchy, they defined collaboration as:

> ...a relational system in which: 1) individuals in a group share mutual aspirations and a common conceptual framework; 2) the interactions among individual are characterized by "justice as fairness"; and 3) these aspirations and conceptualizations are characterized by each individual's *consciousness* of her/his motives toward the other; by *caring* or concern for the other; and by commitment to work with the other over time provided that this *commitment* is a matter of choice (Appley & Winder, 1977, p. 281).

Also contributing to an understanding of the ties between feminism and collaboration is historical inquiry into the lives of eighteenth and nineteenth century American women--particularly white, middle class women. Looking at diaries, letters, and personal records, feminist historians demonstrated the importance and significance of women's associations with other women. Smith-Rosenberg (1975) described American society as characterized by a rigid gender-role differentiation which led to the development of supportive networks of women or a "women's sphere." Cott (1977) asserted that women's friendships were particularly attractive because they represented peer relationships: "[F]emale friendships assumed a new value in women's lives in this era because relations between *equals*--'peer relationships'--were superseding *hierarchical* relationships as the desired norms of human interaction" (Cott, 1977, p. 187). Cott further suggested that women's reliance on each other "embodied a new kind of group consciousness, one which could develop into a political consciousness" (p. 194).

Freedman (1979) also developed the linkages between the culture of white, native-born, middle class women and feminist politics. She argued that the rise in women's societies and organizations, or "female institution building," although not necessarily representing a political strategy, nevertheless provided nineteenth century middle class women with resources which were integral to the emergence of feminist politics. Freedman further suggested that the integrationist strategies which replaced separatism after the success of the suffrage movement may explain the

erosion of the women's culture and the decline of feminism after 1920. Applying her theses to women in universities, she observed:

> ...the success of the first generation of female academics did not survive past the 1920s, not only because of men's resistance, but as Rosalind Rosenberg has explained, "Success isolated women from their culture and placed them in an alien and often hostile community." Many academics who cut off their ties to other women lost the old feminine supports but had no other supports to replace them.

Conclusions which Freedman drew from the history of women's institution building--with contemporary women's studies departments serving as just one notable example--are that women must draw on the cultural resources that emanate from a separate and distinct women's culture while continuing to examine that culture critically.

Rosenberg's research into the feminization of the curriculum at the University of Chicago at the turn of the century revealed the extent of women's gains and losses as a result of their integration into male-dominated universities. "The triumph of higher education in America had a major impact on feminism," she (1979, p. 338) asserted and further argued:

> The ideological change fostered by work in the social sciences freed women from the restrictions imposed by old prejudices about female inferiority, but at the same time undermined the sense of support women had enjoyed as members of a distinctive and self-consciously separate community. Having won a place within higher education, women suffered the strain of no longer feeling secure in the old, separate world of womanhood, and maternal nurture, without being fully accepted or feeling comfortable within the new world of professionalism and science (Rosenberg, 1979, p. 338).

O'Connor's (1992) research into women's friendships, building on the work of feminist historians, has attempted to contribute a more complex and critical literature. Concluding from her review of the limited research on friendship that this area of study has been overlooked and frequently trivialized, she argued that friendship is a culturally constructed form of relationship

which varies both historically and cross-culturally, that friendships have an effect on the individual's identity and well-being, and that they play a part in reflecting and reinforcing class position and marital status. Significant to this research, O'Connor suggested that one of the most important questions which needs to be addressed is the extent to which women's friendships are liberating or limiting forces.

Collaboration and Coauthorship in Academic Scholarship

Focusing on the male scientists who dominated "big science," research interest in scholarly collaboration and teamwork appeared in the social science literature in the decades after World War II (Eaton, 1951; Hagstrom, 1964, 1965). By the 1970s and '80s, however, women were included as subjects and authored such studies with greater frequency. Chubin (1974) and Mackie (1976) found that women as well as men published a significant amount of collaborative research although women who published collaboratively tended to receive first author recognition less often than men. Wilkie and Allen (1975) found that two women were much more likely to collaborate equally than two men or a man and a women. Fox and Faver's scholarship and experience as collaborative research partners revealed a long-standing interest in the careers of academic women (1981), in the process of managing collaborative work successfully (1982), and in the negative consequences of collaborative work for the advancement of science and scholarship (1984).

Long and McGinnis (1981) looked at organizational context in the careers of male biochemists and found institutional characteristics to be stronger determinants of research productivity than the faculty member's previous level of productivity. By adding women biochemists to his sample in a follow-up study, Long (1990) found collaboration with mentors to be the most important factor affecting productivity. Hunter and Kuh (1987) researched the characteristics of prolific contributors to the higher education literature and found almost half of the respondents indicated that a mentor was of critical importance to their acquisition of research interests and skills. Sponsors were particularly helpful in securing the initial and subsequent positions, serving as role models, becoming established in professional associations and networks, and collaborating on

research and publication activities. Significantly, women scholars were more likely than their male counterparts to collaborate with students in publication activities.

Also looking at styles of collaborative scholarship, Bayer and Smart (1991) found in a longitudinal study of academic male chemists that the proportion of single-authored and dual authored papers declined over the career, but the proportion of published team research papers increased over time. By mid-career more than one-half of published papers were multi-authored. Analyzing authorship patterns in sociology journals, Ward and Grant (1991) found coauthorship to be more common than solo-authorship for both women and men, although women coauthored more frequently than men. They also found that scholars writing on gender coauthored more frequently than scholars writing on other topics, that rates of coauthorship were lower in national mainstream journals than other sources, and that women were less likely to occupy dominant-author position in mainstream journal articles than elsewhere.

In a 1992 interpretive study Baldwin and Austin analyzed the language that participants used to describe long term collaborative partnerships. Finding that faculty members in the field of higher education used a variety of metaphors to describe their collaborative relationships, they concluded that "[a] good collaborative relationship has many of the qualities of a good marriage, a successful creative alliance, or a winning sports team" (Baldwin & Austin, 1992, p. 8).

Methodology

Within the social sciences, collaboration has been most frequently investigated using bibliometric or survey methods, often focusing on citation counts and name ordering patterns. Although these methods have yielded important findings, they are not well suited for capturing the meanings which individual and groups of scholars construct of their experiences as collaborators. Nor are these traditional quantitative methods adequate for feminist inquiry which is grounded in the lived experiences of women (Fonow & Cook, 1991). The purpose of this study was to describe how feminism, collaboration, and scholarship interrelate and, in so doing, to gain a deeper understanding of collaboration as a dynamic process in which women faculty form

meaningful relationships in the advancement of their scholarship. In order to accomplish this goal, the inquiry was guided by the following research question: What are the social relationships that develop among feminist women who collaborate in their research?

The researcher chose an interpretive research design employing qualitative "conversations" (Kvale, 1992) for the study. Following a protocol which consisted of 35 open-ended questions, the researcher tape-recorded, transcribed, and analyzed each semi-structured interview. Curriculum vita and other written documents (e.g. published journal articles, conference papers, and drafts of articles in progress) were also collected and used for limited triangulation purposes. Data were coded and thematically analyzed based on Strauss and Corbin's (1990) analytical coding process.

A purposeful, criterion-based sampling technique (Patton, 1990) was used to select the women for participation in the study. Criteria established for sample selection included:

1. Employment status as a full-time tenured or tenure-accruing faculty member at one of two Carnegie Foundation type I research universities in the Midwest United States;
2. A core, joint, or adjunct appointment[1] in a department of women's studies; and
3. Experience collaborating with another woman on a research project, a scholarly paper or article, or project in the creative arts.

Women in the final sample represented eighteen different academic departments and fields in the social sciences, humanities, and professional school as is typical of women's studies faculty in most research institutions (Rosser, 1986). Twenty-three participants were white, three were women of color, and two claimed other ethnic backgrounds or national heritages. Fourteen of the participants described themselves as currently having life partners, and 12 of those 14 were either married or remarried. Eight were divorced, and 14 had children and/or stepchildren. Three

[1]This criterion was used to identify feminist faculty members. Research universities selected as sites of the study had a formal process of reviewing a scholar's research and course content for coherence with the women's studies program's feminist ideology and goals.

identified themselves as lesbians. Participants ranged in age from their mid-thirties to their late sixties and, in the year of the completion of their highest degree, from 1955 to 1990.

Findings: Relationships Between Collaborating Partners

Women in this study had collaborated and, in most cases, were still collaborating in their scholarship with a variety of individuals--friends and colleagues; students and advisors; and partners, husbands, and other relatives. Some majority women had designed studies and coauthored publications only with other white, American women; others had worked closely with women of color, women of other nationalities and ethnicities, and with men as well as women. Some participants had worked almost entirely in collaborative research relationships; others had collaborated formally on a publication or paper only once. Despite the wide range of relationships they described in their conversations, four major types of relationships appeared with regularity in the study. These are labeled and described by the researcher as **pedagogical, instrumental, professional,** and **intimate.**

"Pedagogical" collaborations exhibited a concern for nurturance and growth. "Instrumental" relationships were formed for a specific purpose or project, and "professional" collaborations were characterized by a shared research agenda, multiple collaborative projects, and a longer term collegial relationship. "Intimate" collaborations were characterized by an emotional and intellectual closeness, shared understandings, and an ease of communication. Although these are presented below as four separate types, they are rarely separate or discrete in practice. One relationship may suggest several types as it evolves. Other relationships cannot be easily described as any particular type. Participants who collaborated frequently may have had one relationship that was described as pedagogical, another that was considered to be more instrumental in its purpose, and a third that was intimate.

Collaboration as Pedagogy

For women faculty in this study, nurturing the development of others was an important aspect of their feminism and of their perception of the scholarly role. A majority of the participants agreed

that working closely with another scholar on a shared intellectual project was an important way to foster growth and learning. Thus, collaboration as a form of teaching or mentoring was described often in this study and by a majority of the participants. It was practiced by faculty who collaborated with students and by senior faculty who collaborated with their junior, and usually younger, less-experienced colleagues.

Collaboration in Associate Professor Phyllis Brown's[2] social sciences department is a value the faculty share, and she saw a lot of student/faculty collaboration being performed there. "A lot of it centers around busy faculty with lots of ideas. Students are interested in some of these same things." Including students in research that leads to jointly-authored papers was viewed as a way "of getting research out in a place with not very many resources--a better way than paying students just to collect data." Dr. Brown hinted, however, at some ambivalent feelings about collaborating with students and admitted that she chose her collaborators carefully. "I collaborate mostly with female students....I view collaboration with students as a mutual thing." She explained:

> Part of my feminism was trying to get into the system, so that, for example, I can choose what doctoral students' committees I'll be on--and they tend to be heavily women, or men who I valued... I'll put my energy into helping minority students who are weak and some women who are weak. I can't help all of the weak students.

Being part of a student/faculty research group not only added to Dr. Lisa Gamble's feelings of professional competence but helped her to develop close friendships with other women scholars. An associate professor in a professional field, she explained: "You still feel a real close bond with those people--socially and emotionally as well as professionally--knowing that those are your colleagues who you can go to when you need help." As a faculty member however, she had serious concerns with the possible exploitation of students. Like most of the other participants in

---

2 All participants names used in this paper are code names. References to their specific institutions, schools, departments, and fields, other than women's studies, have been omitted in order to protect the identities of the individual participants.

the study, Lisa did not agree that faculty should coauthor a student's research "unless the faculty member really writes or contributes something significant." She admitted that her opinion was not the dominant one in her department and described it as "an ethical issue without a right answer."

Dr. Marian Thomas's experience as a new assistant professor working with a graduate student demonstrated that faculty too can be vulnerable in student/faculty research. She recounted an unhappy experience with a graduate assistant who became interested in data she was collecting for Marian's own research. Unaware of the ethics of the situation, the student took Marian's data and worked on the topic with another faculty member. Despite the experience, Marian welcomed the opportunity to work with students who are interested in her area. Having lacked female mentors and collaborative opportunities as a student, she was aware of just how important and advantageous they could be. She credited her collaborative research experience with a senior colleague for her growth as a feminist and as a scholar.

Dr. Jill Hastings, an assistant professor in a the social sciences, described her feminism as motivating her to help other women to recognize their choices and "not get locked into certain ideas of how you're supposed to do things." She described herself as committed to empowering her students and recalled the importance of her own collaboration with a competent female scholar whom she could emulate. "Collaborating with her allowed me to feel more valued," she admitted, wanting to function in that same capacity with students. "Even though I've done a lot of research, I still think of myself primarily as a teacher" and teaching is one way she expressed her feminism.

Professor Nancy Connor, a senior woman in a professional field who was beginning to talk about retirement, had few opportunities to direct doctoral dissertations and to write with students because of her particular research speciality. Nevertheless, she was committed to helping women and young scholars. She observed:

> If you can pair some experience with inexperience, it really helps to serve in a mentoring way to that person coming along. I'd like to see a lot more of that--particularly young scholars now. The tenure mill is tough--they're scrambling for

> six years. If they can get some help, it's useful to them. On the other side of that, sometimes young scholars are a real shot in the arm for somebody like me.

Sharing Professor Connor's commitment to younger scholars, Dr. Edith Ross, also a professor in a professional field, described her own feminist stance toward collaboration:

> Collaboration is working in a fashion where everybody has input, that everybody's empowered to have equal input....If I'm a senior now, a senior person in my field, and I'm working with more junior women...we're listed equally. I may have contributed more because of my experience, but I don't want to get into that issue. Others mentored me. Now I will mentor them.

Instrumental Relationships

This type of collaboration encompasses relationships that were formed in order to accomplish a specific objective or to work on a single project. Scholars came together in instrumental collaborations for reasons that were primarily pragmatic, such as needing someone with a particular skill or resource to complement their own research expertise. Another reason for engaging in an instrumental collaboration was desiring the experience of working on a particular project, investigating a topic of special interest, or working with a particular person. Some collaborations with students and new faculty were more pragmatic than pedagogical even though learning was a benefit. As Dr. Betty Line recalled:

> Politically it was very important to collaborate when I was young, because I needed the strength of the senior people. They needed my abilities, but they had years and status. So there are times early in my career where I was the worker and they were the name and we used each other mutually.

Associate professor Patricia Carter's reason for collaborating on a survey with a colleague at another institution was their mutual need to publish. "She had the expertise in the area and we were friends--she was in the same kind of situation I was--in terms of publications." Pat described how they "carved it in half after we did the paper" with each of them approaching the data from a different point of view. They published both as coauthored articles.

Social scientist Ellen Frank's comments that she had "coauthors all over the place" also suggested the formation of instrumental relationships motivated by a need to generate research. Ellen, an associate professor, admitted that few people worked together in her field 15 years ago but that it has become increasingly common as the field becomes more like the natural sciences. She described herself as having been drawn increasingly into collaborative work over time. "It's very nice. You can keep a lot of balls in the air at one time." She admitted, however, that collaboration requires compromise and a willingness to give up some control, "Sometimes the paper doesn't look exactly like the way you would have written it."

Joining with other researchers in order to generate articles--to increase one's efficiency and productivity--was more frequently seen in the social science disciplines than in other fields represented in this study. However, women in the humanities also collaborated for pragmatic reasons, often joining forces to co-edit a journal or anthology or to take on a larger project than one can do alone. Much like Dr. Frank's description of collaboration as a division of labor, collaborators in the humanities also divided up the work in ways that were perceived as efficient, reflecting their particular strengths and interests. For example, Dr. Marjorie Baker, a professor in the humanities, described how she and her collaborating partner prepared a commemorative volume, "I worked mostly with the publisher...and when there were problems with contributors, it was [her] turn to get on their case. She oversaw the final preparation of the copy editing." They both wrote essays for the volume and collaborated on the introduction. Assistant Professor Suzanne Smith described her collaboration similarly:

> It appeared that we had the perfect combination of all the resources to get the project going....It was something that needed to be done and we thought we could do it....Together we had enough need, enough resources, enough opportunity to think the project into existence.

Professional Collaboration Partnerships

Less common than other types of collaborative relationships, professional partnerships were characterized by shared research agendas and long-term relationships, often lasting several years

and through many research and writing projects. The relationships that developed between professional collaborators were cordial and friendly, but they lacked the intensity that characterized intimate collaborations. Dr. Nina Caruso, an assistant professor in a social science discipline, was currently involved in a large grant-sponsored, multi-year project that was, or had the potential to become, a professional collaboration. She typically had several research projects and relationships going at one time, some pedagogical and others intimate. However, Dr. Caruso's relationships occasionally had characteristics of the long-term professional relationships that lead to multiple publications over several years. Nina also admitted that she was a private person who separated her personal life from her professional life. Discussing her relationships with her colleagues, she explained:

> Most of my collaborators are friends of mine.... Basically [the relationships] evolved as friendships after the research part. And we socialize. But we usually socialize [in a way] that is removed from the actual work that we're doing. There is a distinction between what's social and what's work.

Dr. Taylor Woodrow, whose collaborative partnerships best illustrate the category, had several long-term relationships over the course of her scholarly career. A social sciences professor, she portrayed her relationships as friendly "but never to the point that it dominates." Describing her current research partnership, she explained:

> I'd say we're good collegial friends....We go to professional meetings together, room together to save money...and the families are friendly.... There is a difference between a good collegial friend and a good friend. There is always a little reserve with a collegial friend that you're not going to have with a personal friend.

Her current professional collaboration was "a long term successful one with grants, papers, [a] book, and presentations." She explained how the relationship began more than six years before the study:

> We sort of plunged in--we sort of knew each other a little bit socially, both women, both in the department, both at about the same career stage. We had very similar

> methodological interests and complementary substantive interests. That turned out to be a very good basis for collaboration. But I didn't really know her. We sort of ignored that.

Dr. Woodrow's involvement in long-term research relationships provided a view of collaboration that was missing in the stories of many of the participants. She talked about her experiences as a doctoral student helping her in "laying the foundation for the first major collaborative relationship that I did have as a professional" and how she learned to put differences aside and maintain a positive relationship:

> You have to be a little bit easy going in these relationships...or they'll dissolve....It's not exactly like a marriage, but everybody has to give more than 50%....You do have to understand the ebb and flow. If you're terribly picky or you're terribly demanding in your collaborative relationship, they will not work.

Intimate Collaborations

Unique personal and professional relationships were formed by women in this study who shared their ideas and their scholarly lives with family members, life partners, and very close friends. Also included in this category are close collaborative relationships that developed between women scholars who also shared a particular racial or ethnic identity and expressed that shared identity in their work. Associate Professor Maggie Grant's current relationship with her friend, colleague, and collaborator is unlike any professional relationship Maggie had ever had. A solitary person who was happy to be at home alone with a book, she laughed at how her collaborator kept her connected--"forever dragging me around." In their collaboration, Maggie explained "We just talk to each other....We've got this code. We can say two or three words and she'll know what I'm talking about. We agree on most things."

Intimate relationships like Maggie Grant's often revealed an ease of communication and shared understandings. Professor Lori Boothe struggled to explain the process of writing with her partner and laughed, "It's really funny. It seems like this utterly natural division of labor...we don't even have to talk about it." For Dr. Karen Bell, an associate professor in the humanities, and Nina

Caruso those easy relationships came in their collaborations with other women of color. Nina laughed in explaining, "I think some of the things that you'd have to explain to an Anglo woman you don't necessarily have to explain. But also I think how we view the world and how we view certain things, it's also shaped by that." Dr. Bell wondered, "I don't know whether it's because [she] is my friend and we have the same aspirations, the same rhythms--we were like Frick and Frack. We laugh about that so much now." More seriously, she continued, "We are two people who are dedicated to teaching...we are highly politicized, very conscious of our racial and gender positioning in mainstream academia at this point in the century."

Associate Professor Sally Miller agreed that communication with her collaborator, a close family member, was easy, describing how they understand each other's looks and moods. Collaboration with a close relative, however, meant that they occasionally have to deal with feelings of jealousy, competition, and resentment. Sally portrayed a relationship that was both permanent and changing:

> We always used to have each other read our papers that we'd done singly. And critique each other. And there was a time when she stopped giving hers to me. And then I stopped too. But now she's started up again, and I don't know what prompted that or what prompted the stopping. I think there was an awareness of something going on and some kind of resentment. I don't know.

Sharing is a key word in the stories that feminist women told about their "intimate" collaborations. Jill Hastings pointed out that that is why many of them were attracted to the academy. As Maggie Grant, Nina Caruso, and Karen Bell illustrate, they often shared a way of talking, a network of friends, membership in a particular culture, and other aspects of their personal and professional lives. Occasionally, they shared homes and families. Sally Miller collaborated with students, former students, occasionally with her husband, and most frequently with a female relative. Lori Boothe and Phyllis Brown collaborated with their life partners, and six of the participants collaborated occasionally with their spouses. Collaborating with a loved one added another dimension to an already complex and emotionally intimate relationship. Lori

explained, "We're partners as well as collaborators so this is a small part of the whole piece of our relationships....I suppose in a way it makes us even closer."

Discussion

Four patterns of relationships were described by the participants in this study. Three of the patterns--pedagogical, instrumental, and professional--displayed characteristics and structures observed by other researchers. As early as 1951, Eaton distinguished between a hierarchical structure found increasingly in multi-professional teams in industry and a democratic, unstructured form of collaboration more typically found in university settings. Hagstrom (1964) later differentiated between "modern" bureaucratic, industry-based research teams and two "traditional" forms of freely collaborating academic teams more often associated with university research--colleagial and professor/student or professor/technician. Wilkie and Allen (1975) identified three forms which they labeled complementary, supplementary, and coequal, and later Smart and Bayer (1986) divided Hagstrom's traditional partnership types into complementary, supplementary, and master-apprentice.

This study, however, identifies a fourth relationship pattern that is characterized by an intellectual and emotional closeness between partners. It is significant that intimate collaborative relationships have not been identified and described in the formal, published studies[3] of academic collaboration and coauthorship. Not surprisingly, the affective qualities that develop in academic research relationships have not been captured by traditional quantitative research methods. Although a scholarly interest in the qualitative aspects of women's research relationships has emerged in feminist research (Kaplan & Rose, 1993; Oakley, 1981; Reinharz, 1984, for example), a majority of the studies of collaboration and coauthorship in university scholarship have been conducted by and focused exclusively on academic men (Long & McGinnis, 1981; Bayer &

[3] They are suggested however in biographical and autobiographical accounts of research partnerships such as Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson, for example.

Smart, 1991, for example). Descriptions of intimate collaborations such as those described in this study are absent.

Although their valuing of close personal relationships with other women emerged as an important finding, one should not conclude that women's academic careers are of less importance than their relationships, another stereotype with which professional women in all fields have been burdened. In fact, findings from this study regarding the friendships that women faculty form with their collaborators in professional, pedagogical, and instrumental relationships are mixed. Some women preferred to maintain a professional distance from their academic colleagues, even those with whom they socialized. They described their professional lives as separate from their personal lives. Others preferred to combine work and close friendships. No participant, however, felt that she compromised her work product in order to maintain a friendship, although several admitted that they chose not to collaborate with other women if they felt such an involvement would harm the relationship.

It is not surprising that institutional and disciplinary norms determined acceptable forms of collaborative scholarship and also influenced the type of relationship that women faculty developed. In spite of their adherence to those norms however, participants in this study strove to model feminist values in their collaborative partnerships. Their desire to function as democratic, equal partners rather than an hierarchical team leaders was consistently expressed, thus lending support to Wilkie and Allen's (1975) finding that women prefer to collaborate with other women as coequals. Even in pedagogical teams consisting of junior and senior faculty or students and professors, women in this study resisted the notions of hierarchy and authority implicit in the masculine "master/apprentice" relationship. Instrumental teams consisting of specialists who might be viewed as "supplementary" collaborators were also described as operating according to a democratic model. Sensitive to relationships of power and exploitation, women faculty in this study attempted to establish relationships based on mutual respect, trust, and support.

As feminist women who were building careers in research universities where the majority of faculty are white men, the enactment of their commitments to feminism and scholarship demanded

both emotional and intellectual resources. Despite the fact that many women faculty either lacked the opportunity or chose not to collaborate formally until later in their careers, the participants in this study found that collaboration with other women was a powerful way to create and to share those resources. They were however selective in their choice of partners, just as they were selective in their choice of projects. Early admonitions that developing female networks, and by implication, collaborating with women may lead to further disadvantage seemed to be of little concern to participants in this study. With the number of senior women increasing in most of the fields represented in this study, women may simply be finding it easier to build productive relationships with insiders who are also women. Far from viewing their collaborations with other women as disadvantageous, most women in this study preferred them.

Thus, the findings in this study further support the claim that women faculty who are feminists seek membership in a supportive community. They experience a lack of close relationships with other women scholars as a professional disadvantage, and they are committed to countering that disadvantage in their work with other women.

Implications and Limitations

Collaboration and coauthorship in academic research and scholarship raise important issues regarding how academic knowledge is constructed and represented, how future scholars are educated, and how members of the academy relate to one another. Despite the pervasiveness and significance of these issues, collaboration and coauthorship are processes and practices that are rarely debated or investigated systematically. There is, however, a growing body of literature in social science disciplines and in the humanities that investigates collaboration and coauthorship as scholarly practices. These studies, including some which are framed by a feminist perspective, suggest that there are similarities as well as differences in the ways that women and men faculty approach their scholarship, interact with colleagues, and experience academic culture. Despite the increasing diversity and richness of these studies however, many of them have looked primarily or

exclusively at white male scientists and/or male-dominated disciplines. Therefore knowledge of faculty women who choose to work collaboratively with other women remains incomplete.

Focusing on the lives of 26 women faculty, this study provides a complement to the research on collaboration that has attempted to assess the effects of collaboration and multiple-authored publications on faculty careers and knowledge construction. Other studies of faculty collaboration have not focused specifically on women's studies faculty in research institutions in order to explore the connections they make between their feminism, scholarship, and working in collaboration with other women.

This study contributes to knowledge of the relationships and friendships that help to support and define academic careers and make productive scholarly lives possible, challenging, but sometimes even inhibiting for many women. Nevertheless it is limited in several important ways. First, it excluded important groups of women faculty: (a) women who work in other types of colleges and universities where research opportunities and expectations are limited; (b) women in the natural sciences or professional schools, such as engineering and medicine, where collaborative research is the norm; (c) women faculty who are not affiliated with women's studies programs; (d) women who work in administrative positions; and (f) collaborating faculty women whose careers have been unfulfilling or unsuccessful and who have left the research university environment. An understanding of feminism, scholarship, and collaboration would be enhanced by hearing the stories of women faculty in these important groups.

A second limitation is the small number of minority women who participated in the study. Women of color, lesbian and gay scholars, faculty who have physical disabilities, and others who are isolated and underrepresented in higher education bring different experiences and meanings to the scholar role. These experiences are important in any study which purports to present a richer description of collaboration.

Third, participants were interviewed individually and privately rather than as collaborating pairs or teams of faculty women. Knowledge of collaboration constructed by groups of women might provide a view of relationships and socially constructed identities missing in this study. A careful

consideration of these contexts, although fruitful areas for further research, is outside the scope of this study.

The researcher's conversations with women who collaborate successfully suggest that in-depth studies are also needed to explore other common types of collaboration, with student/faculty research partnerships being a particularly rich area for study. Similarly, other collaborations that display power and status differences, such as those involving women and men, junior and senior faculty, African-American and white faculty, and United States and Latin American researchers deserve scholarly attention. These collaborative relationships raise questions about how the partners manage their differences and how these perceived differences both advance and inhibit meaningful scholarship, democratic relationships, and the development of scholars as individuals.

This study represents an attempt to describe and understand the many ways that scholarship, feminism, and collaboration intersected in the lives of a selected group of women faculty. Although efforts were made to maximize diversity in rank, discipline, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, and other demographic characteristics, the researcher is not claiming to describe all faculty women or all women's studies faculty. Clearly there is need for additional investigation if these relationships are to be well understood and generalizations are to be made. The limitations in this study should not, however, prevent important questions from being asked of a specific group of faculty women about the connections they have made among their feminism, their scholarship, and collaboration. To seek to understand their friendships and other social relationships and to capture the meanings they make of their lives is to honor their struggles and achievements and to offer strategies to other women who seek to live productive and affirming lives as academic women.

REFERENCES

Appley, D.G. & Winder, A. E. (1977). Values, attitudes, and skills. Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences, 13(3), 279-291.

Astin, H. (1978). Factors affecting women's scholarly productivity. In Astin & Hirsch (Eds.) The higher education of women (pp. 133-157). New York: Praeger.

Austin, A. E. & Baldwin, R. G. (1991). Faculty collaboration: Enhancing the quality of scholarship and teaching. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 7. Washington, D.C.: George Washington, School of Education and Human Development.

Baldwin, R. G. & Austin, A.E. (1992, October). Toward greater understanding of faculty collaboration: Metaphors, emerging theory, and collaborator's advice. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Minneapolis, MN.

Bayer, A. E. & Astin, H. S. (1975). Sex differentials in the academic reward system. Science, 188, 796-802.

Bayer, A. E. & Smart, J.C. (1991). Career publication patterns and collaborative "styles" in American academic science. Journal of Higher Education, 62, 613-636.

Bernard, J. (1964). Academic women. University Park, PA: University Press.

Chubin, D. (1974). Sociological manpower and womanpower: Sex differences in career patterns of two cohorts of American doctorate sociologists. American Sociologist, 9, 83-92.

Clark, S. M. & Corcoran, M. (1986). Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty: A case of accumulative disadvantage? Journal of Higher Education, 57, 20-43.

Cott, N.F. (1977). The bonds of womanhood: "Woman's sphere" in New England, 1780-1835. New Haven: Yale.

Eaton, J.W. (1951). Social processes of professional teamwork. American Sociological Review, 16, 707-713.

Fonow, M. M. & Cook, J. A. (1991). Back to the future: A look at the second wave of feminist epistemology and methodology. In M.M. Fonow & J.A. Cook (Eds.), Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship As Lived Research (pp. 1-15). Bloomington: Indiana University.

Fox, M. F. (1984). Women and higher education: Sex differentials in the status of students and scholars. In J. Freeman (Ed.), Women: A feminist perspective, (3rd ed., pp. 238-255). Palo Alto: Mayfield.

Fox, M. F. (1985). Publication, performance, and reward in science and scholarship. In J.C. Smart (Ed.), Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, (Vol. I, pp. 255-282). New York: Agathon.

Fox, M. F. & Faver, C. (1981). Achievement and aspiration: Patterns among male and female academic-career aspirants. Sociology of Work and Occupations, 8(4), 439-463.

Fox, M. F. & Faver, C. (1982). The process of collaboration in scholarly research. Scholarly Publishing, 13, 327-339.

Fox, M. F. & Faver, C. (1984). Independence and cooperation in research: The motivations and costs of collaboration. Journal of Higher Education, 55, 347-359.

Freedman, E. (1979, Fall). Separatism as strategy: Female institution building and American feminism, 1870-1930. Feminist Studies, 5(3), 512-529.

Graham, P.A. (1970). Women in academe. Science, 169, 1284-1290.

Graham, P. A. (1978). Expansion and exclusion: A history of women in American higher education. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 3(4), 759-773.

Hagstrom, W. O. (1964). Traditional and modern forms of scientific teamwork. Administrative Science Quarterly, 9, 241-263.

Hagstrom, W. O. (1965) The scientific community. New York: Basic Books.

Hunter, D. E. & Kuh, G. D. (1987). The "write wing". Journal of Higher Education, 58, 443-462.

Kaplan, C. & Rose, E.C. (1993). Strange bedfellows: Feminist collaboration. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 18(3), 547-561.

Kaufman, D. R. (1978). Associational ties in academe: Some male and female differences. Sex Roles, 4.(1), 9-21.

Kvale, S. (1992, April). Inter views and postmodern knowledge. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Langland, E. & Gove, W. (Eds.) (1981). A feminist perspective in the academy: The difference it makes. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Lewin, A. Y. & Duchan, L. (1971). Women in academia. Science, 173, 892-895.

Long, J. S. (1990). The origins of sex differences in science. Social Forces, 68(4), 1297-1315.

Long, J. S. & McGinnis, R. (1981). Organizational context and scientific productivity. American Sociological Review, 46, 422-442.

Mackie, M. (1976). Professional women's collegial relations and productivity: Female sociologists' journal publications, 1967 and 1973. Sociology and Social Research, 61, 277-293.

Menges, R. J. & Exum, W. H. (1983). Barriers to the progress of women and minority faculty. Journal of Higher Education, 54(2), 123-144.

Moore, K. M. & Sagaria, M.A. D. (1991). The situation of women in research universities in the United States: Within the inner circles of academic power. In G. P. Kelly & S. Slaughter (Eds.), Women's higher education in comparative perspective (pp. 185-200). The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Musil, C. T. (1992). The courage to question: Women's studies and student learning, executive summary. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.

New federal data show that minority group members and women slightly increased their share of faculty jobs between 1989 and 1991. (1993, January 6). Chronicle of Higher Education. p. A15.

Oakley, A. (1981). Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms. In H. Roberts (Ed.), Doing feminist research (pp. 30-61). London: Routledge Kegan Paul

O'Connor, P. (1992). Friendships between women. New York: Guilford.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park: Sage.

Ransom, M.R. (1990). Gender segregation by field in higher education. Research in Higher Education, 31(5), 477-494.

Reinharz, S. (1984). On becoming a social scientist. New Brunswick, N J.: Transaction.

Rosenberg, R. (1979). The academic prism: The new view of American women. In R. Berkin & M.B. Norton (Eds.), Women of America: A history (pp. 318-341). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Rosser, S. V. (1986). The relationship between women's studies and women in science. In. R. Bleier (Ed.), Feminist approaches to science (pp. 165-180). New York: Pergamon.

Simeone, A. (1987). Academic women: Working toward equality. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey.

Simon, R. J., Clark, S. M., & Galway, K. (1967). The woman Ph. D.: A recent profile. Social Problems, 15(2), 221-236.

Smart, J. C. & Bayer, A. E. (1986). Author collaboration and impact: A note on citation rates of single and multiple authored articles. Scientometrics, 10, 297-305.

Smith-Rosenberg, C. (1975). The female world of love and ritual: Relations between women in Nineteenth-Century America. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, I(1), 1-29.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Newbury Park: Sage.

Tidball, E. (1976). Of men and research. Journal of Higher Education, XLVII(4), 373-389.

Ward, K. B. & Grant, L. (1991). Coauthorship, gender, and publication among sociologists. In M. M. Fonow & J. Cook (Eds.), Feminist strategies in the study of gender (pp. 248-264). Bloomington: Indiana University.

Wilkie, J. R. & Allen, I. L. (1975). Women sociologists and co-authorship with men. American Sociologist, 10, 19-24.